



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
-----------------	-------------	----------------------	---------------------	------------------

10/763,096

01/22/2004

Timothy Alan Dietz

AUS920030527US1

6048

25299

7590

10/28/2008

IBM CORPORATION

PO BOX 12195

DEPT YXSA, BLDG 002

RESEARCH TRIANGLE PARK, NC 27709

EXAMINER

PARKER, BRANDI P

ART UNIT

PAPER NUMBER

3624

MAIL DATE

DELIVERY MODE

10/28/2008

PAPER

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Office Action Summary	Application No. 10/763,096	Applicant(s) DIETZ ET AL.	
	Examiner BRANDI P. PARKER	Art Unit 3624	

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 17 July 2008.
- 2a) ☒ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☐ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-22 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) 5,6 and 11-18 is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-4, 7-10, and 19-22 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
 2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
 3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- | | |
|--|---|
| 1) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Notice of References Cited (PTO-892) | 4) <input type="checkbox"/> Interview Summary (PTO-413) |
| 2) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) | Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____ |
| 3) <input type="checkbox"/> Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08) | 5) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Informal Patent Application |
| Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____ | 6) <input type="checkbox"/> Other: _____ |

DETAILED ACTION

Acknowledgements

1. The following is a Final Office action in response to communications filed on July 17, 2008. Claims 1, 4, 7 and 10 have been amended. Claims 5-6 and 11-18 have been cancelled. Claims 19-22 are newly added.

Response to Applicant's Remarks

2. Applicant's cancellation of claims 13-18 renders the rejection under 35 U.S.C. § 112, second paragraph moot.

3. In response to Applicant's argument that Edinger does not teach selecting of a category or type of defect, Examiner respectfully disagrees. Edinger teaches selecting the type of defect from a severity category, more than just a making a numerical determination. For example, Edinger describes what type of defect is present under the severity type category (i.e. the customer is able to use the product, but operations are severely limited, or the customer is able to use the product, with less significant features unavailable) (paragraph 0212-0216). Therefore, Edinger does teach and suggest this limitation.

4. In response to Applicant's argument that Schneier teaches the entry of unprompted general comments made by telephone to a service agent, but such

Art Unit: 3624

comments are not relevant to defects or are available for a subsequent market analysis selecting of a category or type of defect, Examiner points out that Applicant's argument relates to the intended use of the system which is not germane to patentability. *In re Casey*, 152 USPQ 235 (CCPA 1967). Therefore, Schneier does teach and suggest this limitation.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

5. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

6. Claims 1-4, 7-10 and 19-22 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Edinger et al (US 2002/0194047) in view of Schneier et al (US 7159237).

7. As to **claims 1, 7 and 19**, Edinger teaches a system for tracking defects in said software products comprising:

- a. a computer controlled display associated with said service center (paragraph 0099, abstract);
- b. means on said display, ancillary to a customer telephone inquiry to said service center, for prompting said service agent at said service center to

Art Unit: 3624

interactively select a software defect category to which said inquiry may relate (paragraph 0212-0228) ; and

c. means on said display responsive to a selection of a software defect category, to interactively prompt said service agent, during said telephone inquiry, to interactively respond to a set of statistical questions related to the tracking of the defect category (paragraph 0217).

d. means for analyzing said stored data (paragraph 0287-0288); and

e. means for distributing the results of the analysis to the developers of said marketed products (paragraph 0263-0264).

Edinger does not teach where the service agent enters unprompted comments. However, Schneier teaches means for enabling the service agent to enter unprompted general comments relative to defects; and wherein said means for analyzing consider said general comments (column/line 13/63-14/17, Figure 7 and 8).

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to include the business system of Edinger with the ability to allow the service agent enters unprompted comments as taught by Schneier since the claimed invention is merely a combination of old elements, and in the combination each element merely would have performed the same function as it did separately, and one of ordinary skill in the art would have recognized that the results of the combination were predictable.

Art Unit: 3624

8. With respect to **claims 2, 8 and 20**, Edinger teaches a database means associated with said service center for storing data representative of the responses of said service agent (paragraph 0017).

9. Regarding **claims 3, 9 and 21**, Edinger teaches means enabling the service agent to optionally enter said data into said database (paragraph 0017, 0212-0228).

2. As to claims **4, 10 and 22**, Edinger teaches means on said display for prompting said service agent prompt on a real-time basis coincident with the time during which the service agent responds within said telephone inquiry (paragraph 0018).

Conclusion

10. Applicant's amendment necessitated the new ground(s) of rejection presented in this Office action. Accordingly, **THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL**. See MPEP § 706.07(a). Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

11. A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire THREE MONTHS from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within TWO MONTHS of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the THREE-MONTH shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of

Art Unit: 3624

the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the date of this final action.

12. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to BRANDI P. PARKER whose telephone number is (571) 272-9796. The examiner can normally be reached on Mon-Thurs. 8-5pm.

13. If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Bradley B. Bayat can be reached on (571) 272-6704. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

14. Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

/BRANDI P PARKER/
Examiner, Art Unit 3624

/Bradley B Bayat/
Supervisory Patent Examiner, Art Unit 3624